

# **Arizona Military Regional Compatibility Project Western Maricopa County / Luke Air Force Base**

## **Political Jurisdictions / Agency Decision Makers Interest Group Meeting December 17, 2002 1:30 pm**

- Introductions
  - Please provide all comments no later than January 27<sup>th</sup> (5:00pm, please)
  - Direct comments to PARSONS
  - Who paid for this and how much did it cost the taxpayers? Response: the State paid \$417,000.
  - What was the Scope of Work for the project? (available at [www.azcommerce.com](http://www.azcommerce.com))
- Chapters 1, 2, & 3
- Chapters 4 & 5
- Chapters 6 & 7
- ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION:
  - Concerns: Tax transfer, establishment of joint powers authority, LUCA-3 (private property rights), moratorium. Surprise has been committed to up-front notification and expanded notification would be an agreeable alternative. This study can be a catalyst to an agreeable document.
  - Two choices: preserve Luke or plan for Luke's demise. Land use restrictions will lead to property owners' diminished land value, which will ultimately lead to compensation issues. Luke has an economic importance. Propose a state initiative to preserve the southern departure corridor. Statewide/countywide sales tax (½ cent). If we don't preserve the Base, many other states would be happy to take on the economic benefits. We need to work with the developers to make this work.
  - Only denial of any benefit of property uses constitutes a taking. Initial value of Luke to the West Valley was huge. This is a state responsibility. The Feds will get the job accomplished. Ultimate use of the 'concrete' we call Luke. They have increased their own value. Joint Strike Fighters? Surely there is an amicable way to get this enforced without taking property rights.

- Florida is a good example of Defense Grants – we need to look at that. Encourage agriculture to stay. 15k' to 30k' APZ II is unclear. Best practices for a notification process.
- Bill 1525 leads to some ground-rules and safeguards for consistency (base command & elected officials).
- \$13 million have been set aside by Congress to be administered by DoD. Restrictions on the amount of ground to protect the base so the \$ aren't wasted. Luke can help us in this effort by doing what? We need to know what Luke can do and what they want to do. Suggests a sales tax statewide that will benefit all the military installations in AZ.
- Support LUCA-1. DO NOT support LUCA-2 or 3. Against the moratorium. Would support any sort of buy-out plan.
- Landowner compensation is important and Luke should get involved at the Pre-Application stage.
- Cost-Benefit Analysis to extension of the notification box to LUCA-3 boundaries.
- Concerns: Constitutionality and enforceability of the plan. We need to show that we've exhausted all financial resources. State's potential role with regard to funding; we need the imposition of reality. It's unrealistic to expect a tax to originate at the Senate. Luke is in large part a federal responsibility. Its mission serves the entire nation. If we let the next year go by without securing some sort of funding for this purpose, an opportunity will have been missed. We need to hear from Luke exactly what they need in order to keep their operations running (\$ amount / priority list).
- Tom from McCain's Office: This is the furthest point reached towards getting a game plan. This is a draft and the process is necessary. We need to remain united on this issue, otherwise in 2005 we will be divided without choice. The dialogue, while not necessarily good news, is important and useful. All of us need to work together to get to the next step. This is the document that will get us there.
- John Nelson: Maybe the main issue shouldn't be Luke but rather an aviation issue
- Senator McCain came to the West Valley and stressed the short timeline where decisions are to be made. LUCA-3: difficult to define how much money would be possible to purchase development rights or acquire lands. Still in the process of defining the southern departure corridor. What will it take to preserve Luke (monies)? Implementation timeframe – need to show a commitment – funding sources for compensation is recommended to be moved up to 2003/4.
- Economic impact analysis should be done.

- Can the communities afford what is being done (the Plan)?
- Look at providing economic impact information to preserve Luke AND look at the re-use idea. Hard to make land use decisions without this valuable economic study.
- SR 303 commercial/industrial corridor strategy should not be carried forward.
- Quantify the noise issue (% of what) – complaints/day? Need to have to put into context of the region to make an informed decision.
- Oppose preemption of local control in land use areas and mandates that are placed on local governments.
- Moratorium – do not carry forward.
- Surprise will provide comments in writing after thoughts from Council.
- Development community will have legal issues with the Plan. People have vested development rights – oppose the moratorium.
- Surprise has been very progressive about the preservation of Luke. Surprise does go to Luke very early in the development process. Signs have been put up over overflight areas to notify residents. Sound attenuation for homes. Does not agree with LUCA-3 land uses (does not want City to turn into warehouses). Need to work together as communities to preserve Luke and go forward.
- Would like to see Surprise having a strong voice in the decision-making process – it affects our community. Don't raise the bar with LUCA-3 – we have already worked with Luke to make compatible land uses.
- Need to look at the economics and decide which way to go.
- Taxing issues should happen first rather than at the end of the process.
- Land and water conservation issues.
- Signage can happen now.
- Joint-use training facility at Luke for police and fire – good idea.
- Question: what are we going to do about encroachment? Luke will be in jeopardy if complaints continue. Does not believe in tax increases coming from the legislature – doubtful of the monies coming from the state.
- Always the same story - same conclusions, but no solutions. Need to come up with viable solutions. State needs to support the cities and counties in the lawsuits, and legislature needs to help out (not necessarily financial).
- Do not want to turn Luke into a commercial airport at Luke AFB. Doubtful of the sales tax idea with the deficit.
- Good process – take the good and the bad and sift through – the process is very good.
- Economic impact analysis is very important.
- Take a look at Williams AFB example.
- Plan needs to speak to protecting the flight path to the Goldwater Range.

- Divide what the restrictions are up into various categories 1-APZs 2-noise contour lines 3-turns that the pilots make 4-airspace 5-land use patterns at elevations. This could get us to making decisions on compatibility.
- How does urban development encourage homes within the 65 dnl contours? We are putting people up against compatible land uses.
- Separate the land use concept/patterns from the noise notifications.
- Where there are existing vested rights – recognize them.
- Need to try and pull all cities together in the process and make sure all cities are on the same page “one extra stone can sink a ship”
- AUX #1 – need to be included in the planning and dialogue.
- Recording of the flight paths – what/where is allowed? Document where they fly below 1,000 feet.
- 1/3 of one cent sales tax would generate 5 billion dollars in one year – why not let the residents of the state decide? Economic analysis provides connection to the tools that can preserve Luke. Communicate what it means to replace the loss to the economy if Luke goes away.
- Strategy 6.8.5 – airspace encroachment – would like to see it carried forward – would really benefit/needs to be addressed – ground -space is no good without airspace. Response: not in the scope of work defined by the state for this contract but is currently being addressed by the state as a stand-alone issue. State has looked at airspace issues – does appear in future projects/grant efforts.
- Need to make a “realistic” list of importance – list things that we can do and that can be implemented – within the next year (signage, open space areas).
- Each jurisdiction should make an effort to MAG to express airspace issues that would support Luke.
- Is there a new noise study out post-95 from Luke? Answer: Luke does have a Draft and Final Environmental Assessment (EA). If we can acquire from the Base, that information would be a part of the Regional Compatibility Plan.
- Further clarify and quantify the inconsistent land use map acreage/where are the areas in relation to the types of uses?
- Sound attenuation and extension of notification to LUCA 3. Wants to keep disclosure and notification separate from land use. Safety and noise / safety or noise. Only one element of disclosure.
- Luke has issues with flying over school sites and because flight paths are so wide, that is a difficult issue.
- Noise studies – how do you get the criteria that relates to noise studies? Opportunity in appendices to apply best practices that cities have applied (disclosure in sales offices, etc.)

- Noise attenuation in higher noise contours can be very extensive and expensive.
- Many factors determine whether or not attenuation should be applied to a certain piece of property (altitude, weather, etc.).
- Bill 1525 was accepted for the noise standards. Material isn't as important as the R-19 walls.
- Impact will occur whether Luke leaves or the plan is passed. What are the critical elements to preserve the mission? Those elements will allow us to amend this plan.
- No way to know which aircraft we will eventually have and we want to be sure not to restrict ourselves.
- Glendale airport has a MOU with Luke maybe other airports should consider the same.
- Compatible flight zones.
- Lot of information put out in the open by the base at an 'open house' type venue.
- Help encourage the sustainability of agriculture; eliminate property taxes on agriculture land.
- No demand for a warehouse district.
- Sub-section 5.8.3: White Tanks originally had 0-1 du/ac for the Luke area. This means that housing is an option, not just warehouses.
- Would like only to be able to utilize the land that is available for development.
- We are willing to discuss things that are relevant and realistic.
- The plan calls for more than just warehouses in the LUCA-3.
- Diminished control of local governments is an agreed upon point.
- We will have to revamp the General Plans to address these things.
- Upzoning / downzoning will require land acquisition – will need to determine the vested land.
- How is grand fathering addressed in the plan? Superzoning by the state. (authority?)
- Current agreements with developers, 20/20 plan is not hard zoned. This country is at war and Luke is important to that effort.
- RECAP
  - LUCA should only be for noise
  - Areas not vested the community should look at give and take options
  - Luke must define criteria and priorities and make public
  - Compensation moved up in process
  - Quantify issues
  - Work together
  - Different altitudes

- Cost/Benefit analysis
- Look at these comments for benefit of study sessions ([www.azcommerce.com](http://www.azcommerce.com))